

REMARKS

Claims 54, 59, 67-69, 78-79, 88-89, 92, and 94-95 are Previously Presented to clarify the present invention, without acquiescence in cited basis for rejection or prejudice to pursue in a related application. Claim 59 is also amended to correct typographical errors and to clarify the invention. No new matter has been added.

§ 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 54-96 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dieckman, D., “*DISCOE: Distributed Design and Analysis to Preserve Intellectual Property*.” (hereinafter Dieckman). Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants note that “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP 2131.

I. For claims 54, the Advisory Action further cites to p. 59 of Dieckman and concludes that since “DISCOE users may search multiple remote IP catalogs and select components that satisfy their needs,” Dieckman thus discloses the claimed limitations of “ranking the one or more integrated circuit design resources” of claim 54. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Dieckman discloses the provision of catalogs and libraries from multiple vendors and placing such information online for use or access by others. Applicants respectfully submit that although such parts or services may or may not be displayed to the users in certain order, Dieckman does not, however, disclose, teach, or suggest that such information is ranked by any means. Similarly, the cited passage on p. 59 of Dieckman merely discloses that a user may search the IP catalogs and selects components therefrom but does not disclose that DISCOE ranks the search results in response to the user’s search in any fashion.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Dieckman does not teach, disclose, or suggest at least the above claimed limitation of claim 54 and thus may not be used to preclude the patentability of claim 54. Claims 69 and 79 respectively represent the computer program product and system claim reciting similar limitations as does claim 54. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 54, 69, 79, and their respective dependent claims are thus allowable over Dieckman for at least the reasons presented above.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, all claims are believed to be allowable. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-2518, referencing billing number **7010223001**. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-2518, referencing billing number **7010223001**.

Respectfully submitted,
Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: October 5, 2006

By: _____



Erich C. Tzou
Registration No. 56,927

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (650) 849-4962
Telefax: (650) 849-4800